DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 809 CS 211 662

AUTHOR Allen, Michael S.; Roswell, Barbara Sherr
TITLE Self-Evaluation in Holistic Assessment.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (40th, Seattle, WA, March 16-18, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Freshman Composition; Higher Education; Holistic Evaluation; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Student Attitudes; *Writing Evaluation; *Writing Processes; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS Goucher College MD; *Process Approach (Writing); Writing Strategies

ABSTRACT

To link writing assessment more closely to writing pedagogy, a project added a process instrument--a self-evaluation or "postwrite"--to a formal holistic writing assessment. Subjects were 348 freshman composition students at Goucher College. The postwrite asked students, after they had finished writing an essay, to answer four questions regarding what problems they faced while writing the essay, what solutions they considered for these problems, what alternative plans they considered and why they rejected those plans, and what they would do if they were to continue working on the essay. Evaluation showed that students fared better on their postwrites than on their essays. Patterns in postwrite responses showed general-intention responses, general-strategy responses, task-specific-strategy responses, teacher talk, and writer's talk. Self-evaluation changes the essential meaning of writing assessment from the assessment of writing to the assessment of writers. It treats writing as a process, as a multiple construct, and elicits information that can help both teacher and learner. Self-evaluation has major effects on students, removing a wall between assessment and pedagogy by making writing assessment a learning experience, helping students to talk like writers and see themselves as writers, and placing the writing task within the greater context of writing as revision. (One graph is included; the postwrite instrument and evaluation guidelines are attached.) (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael S. Allen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

ED303809

Self-Evaluation in Holistic Assessment

Michael S. Allen, Walsh College
Barbara Sherr Roswell, Goucher College

Several years ago, Donald Murray said that "process cannot be inferred from product any more than a pig can be inferred from a sausage." Despite the nearly universal belief that writing should be considered and taught as a dynamic, complex process, most assessments of student writing--whether in the classroom or in large scale placement and proficiency testing--continue to infer the pig from the sausage, and to judge written products only.

This discrepancy is troubling, not only because of the inconsistencies between pedagogy and evaluation, but also because, as Mischenbaum et. al. have written, "it is not only what students do in a situation but also what they say about what they do that provides a useful basis for understanding and predicting behavoir" (quoted in Faigley, 190-191). My colleague Barbara Roswell and I were intrigued by the possible usefulness of adding some kind of process instrument to an otherwise fairly standard holistic writing assessment, linking assessment more closely to writing pedagogy.

What we found was that self-evaluations can be useful in holsitic assessment; indeed, they may contain as much information about students as writers as does the written product itself--which is exactly what we need for placement and evaluation. In our study, the self-evaluations told us more than we expected; while they gave us information about students' writing processes and procedures, we also found information about their sense of identity as writers and their ways of knowing through language. In this paper, we want to discuss the self-evaluation, or "postwrite," we developed, its place in the assessment instrument, and its broader implications for the assessment of writing.

The Project:

Our research into self-evaluation began as part of a pilot project in assessing the writing of first year students at Goucher College in December, 1987. For some time, Mike had been interested in post-writing as a pedagogical tool, asking his students, on days when they handed in essays, to write in their journals about the problems they had encountered and what they had learned from writing the essay. What he had

CS211642

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

called postwrites, Lester Faigley, et. al. have called "process instruments," which can "assist in focusing conferences concerning first drafts...as starting points for discussions..." (191). Often students correctly assessed their writing problems, and over time grew in their ability to discuss and ultimately control their writing. Both of us were interested in applying the postwrite to a formal, holistic writing assessment, to see if such an addition to a writing sample could a) make the testing situation more like the process-centered writing students do in class, and b) yield information about students' writing processes which would be useful in evaluating a student's writing ability.

Our project yielded a surplus of information and ideas, and we both appreciate the funding from the Goucher Faculty Development Committee, the work of Gail Goldberg, Writing Specialist for the Maryland Department of Education, who acted as our consultant and trainer, and also the work of the English department's writing faculty. Since this was a pilot project, no requirements were made for instructors to use the results of the assessment test in computing their grades for the Freshman Composition Course, English 104. While this context for the project made it less of a formal assessment, it nonetheless allowed us to conduct an exploratory study of student performance on self-evaluations in an holistic writing assessment.

The Assessment Instrument:

The test itself was designed to gain as much information as possible about student writing abilities. We wanted to parallel most academic tasks by giving students a text that they could summarize and respond to in some way. The test had four parts: 1) a two paragraph passage from Neil Postman's *The Disappearance of Childhood* (1982) for summary; 2) an essay; 3) a self-evaluation (or "postwrite"); and 4) a passage for editing. Students were asked to an essay which did one of three things: 1) argued for or against the author's main point; 2) explained and explored the implication of the passage; or 3) analyzed the rhetoric and style of the passage. The instruction page plus the passage were handed out to students during the last week of classes; that is, students were given a week to read over the requirements of the test, to reflect on the passage, and to plan their essay before writing it during examination week.

We do not have time to discuss the entire assessment instrument, but we will say that we have some reservations about two parts: the Postman passage we selected and the editing passage. However, the performance on the self-evaluations exceeded our

expectations. The postwrite format was quite simple and straightforward. We asked students, after they had finished their essays, to answer a few questions. We indicated that there were no right or wrong answers to these questions, but said, "we are interested in your analysis of your experience writing this essay." In short, we wanted to frame the postwrite as a place for informal talk, as a place where there was no pressure to perform or to be correct. Similarly, we kept our questions short and simple: 1) What problems did you face during the writing of this essay? 2) What solutions did you find for these problems? 3) What alternative plans for this essay did you consider? Why did you reject them? 4) Imagine you had more time to write this essay. What would you do if you were to continue working on it?

Following those four questions (which are closely related to the four questions Faigley, et. al. ask in their self-evaluations), we asked students to rank four elements of composition according to priority: development and support of thesis, organization of the essay, address of the intended audience, and formation of paragraphs and sentences. Although we explained the ranking ("with 1 most important and 4 least important"), we found this fifth question to be confusing to many students and evaluators--for example, some students ranked all four aspects with 1, or with 1 and 2. In the evaluation session, we quickly began to discount the fifth question and used the first four questions as the basis for evaluating the postwrites.

Even though the great majority of students had never been asked to perform any self-evaluation after having completed a writing task, they easily accepted it as part of the assessment instrument. In some ways, this may be our most important finding. We can even say that some students were <u>eager</u> to write a self-evaluation after writing their summary and argument. It seemed as though many students wanted to "talk," or write informally, about the writing experience they had just finished. Although we found a few students--some of them were the better writers--who ignored the postwrite or answered only one or two of the postwrite questions, the overwhelming majority of students answered all the questions.

We theorized first that, after having written their summary and essay, students were using the postwrite to "unwind". But the answers were more serious than simply an emotional "letting go." More to the point, the student answers were more like a "debriefing," a replay of information, talking it out, regaining authority over the experience. We remembered how, after tests, we and other students often turned to each other, and--more than just moaning and groaning--said things like "Could you

believe what she asked on problem 12?" or "I had trouble with that short essay on page two--how'd you do?" Student debriefings take place any time students exit an examination or come out of their "test-taking mode"; it is their way of re-establishing their own sense of authority, their own emotional stance, after having taken a test. What the postwrites did was to allow students to talk to themselves first, to bring to the surface and to work off of what Vygotsky calls "inner speech"--that first level of consciousness which informs our thinking and is the bridge between thought and language. This talk allowed them to make their writing experience their own and reminded them of their power as writers as they conducted their own "debriefing". What they say as they debrief, we feel, is valuable in assessing their performance and their competence as writers.

Evaluating Postwrites:

In our test development and evaluation training sessions, we outlined in very general terms what would constitute a credit for the postwrite. We began with the twin assumptions that the postwrite's value lay in: 1) its revealing a student's accuracy in assessing his or her performance , and 2) its giving an indication of the student's "greater capability" in writing--greater than perhaps had been demonstrated by the writing sample. We asked evaluators to find either "no evidence of greater capability" or "significant evidence of greater capability." Please refer to the handout I have given you to see the full postwrite rubric.

These criteria, we felt, covered our dual purposes for the postwrite: to make the writing test environment more natural by asking students to talk about their revision plans, and to provide a way for students to assess their problems with writing in an assessment situation. What we found in our review of the postwrites, after the test evaluation, was that our criteria were too general; that postwrites had a value in and of themselves, apart from their "environmental" and revision-oriented purposes.

The total writing assessment instrument had a possible score of 6: 1 point for the summary, a possible 4 points for the essay, and 1 point for the postwrite. We felt that such a scoring spread was fair to students and to the various priorities of the departmental evaluators. The summaries, essays and postwrites were scored holistically by the writing program staff, with every essay being read twice and the essays with divergent scores being read a third time. As a whole, the first year class of 1987 at Goucher College did not do very well on the writing assessment. Evaluators were struck

by the difficulty some students had in writing summaries, a writing task that had been stressed in almost every section of the course; and evaluators were also impressed by the difficulty many students had in organizing a convincing argument, or maintaining a consistent voice, or developing their ideas with details. Over two-thirds of the 348 essays received a score of 2 or 1; only 29% of the essays received scores of 3 or 4. Compared to those scores, the students fared better on their postwrites. Of the 348 tests, 149, or 43%, received credit for their postwrite answers. Moreover, those 149 postwrites were spread throughout the range of essay scores on an ascending curve (please see the accompanying graph): 29% of essays given a score of 1 received a credit for the postwrite, whereas 41% of essays scoring 2 received a postwrite credit, and 59% of essays scoring 3 and 65% of essays scoring 4 received a postwrite credit.

We found the spread of postwrite scores to be quite heartening, for it indicated two things: 1) generally, the better the writer, the more likely that she or he was able to articulate writing problems, writing strategies and revision plans--echoing the differences between novice and expert writers in the thinking-aloud protocols of Flower and Hayes (1980); and 2) a wide variety of student writers, from those who have difficulty with writing to those who write with ease, wrote successfully about their writing process for this task, indicating that the postwrite can provide an additional source of evaluation unavailable if only the essay itself is evaluated.

Postwrites and the Evaluators:

Although none of the evaluators had ever scored a self-evaluation as part of a writing assessment, we feel that their scoring of the postwrite was responsive, that they were able to use the rubric appropriately and sensitively. We followed up the evaluation sessions with a questionnaire, asking the evaluators to reflect on the postwrite as part of the assessment instrument. From those questionnaires we found the evaluators to be tentative about postwrites and their evaluation of the postwrites, but nonetheless highly supportive of the usefulness and the appropriateness of postwrites as a feature of holistic assessment. We found that the evaluators' estimate of the number of postwrite credits given (37.5%) was not far from the actual number (43%). We asked evaluators what impressed them most about the postwrites; here is a sample of their responses:

> What impressed me most was their (students) repetition of desiderata like "use more examples!" It sounded to me as if they were regurgitating teacher comments without a clear idea of how "writing strategies" actually would apply to their own writing.
>
> What really impressed me--or depressed me--was how vaguely students generalized about the porcess of writing.
>
> Postwrites, I think, are a useful addition to a writing exam because 1) it (sic) reminds students that writing is a rational process with steps that demand conscious--not merely intuitive--attention; 2) it's a merciful and fair means of evaluating less practiced writers who may have just learned the elements of clear writing . . . and 3) the postwrite gives faculty an opportunity to evaluate which and how many of our own lessons impressed our students.

Patterns in Postwrite Responses:

Again, although these evalutors had never before used self-evaluations in holistic assessment, their comments about the vagueness of most student postwrites point to the key element in evaluating postwrites. The patterns displayed on these self-evaluations followed closely the patterns in self-evaluation noted by Lester Faigley et. al. in *Assessing Writers' Knowledge and Processes of Composing* (1985). In the chapter "How Process Instruments Show Changes in Strategies," Faigley and his colleagues constructed a rubric for assessing self-evaluations. Their rubric was based on self-evaluations of un-timed, non-test situation writing tasks. Faigley and colleagues cited the statement by Meichenbaum et. al. we referred to in the opening of our paper: " it is not only what students do in a situation, but also what they say about what they do that provides a useful basis for understanding and predicting behavior."

That statement provides the theoretical premise for using self-evaluation. Faigley et. al. borrowed the crucial aspect of specificity from Flower and Hayes (1980), who found the characteristic difference between the thinking-aloud protocols of expert and novice writers to be the degree of specificity they used as they talked about their writing. Faigley adapted from Gruson, the author of a disseration on effective piano-practicing skills, a taxonomy that "can be used to classify reports of

metacognitive strategies in the execution of many kinds of processes" (192). They developed it into the following rubric for assessing self-evaluations:

> 1. General-Intention Responses . . . give no indication of specific composing strategies. . . ("I really tried to do my best").
> 2. General-Strategy Responses . . . reflect a general approach that might apply to all writing situations . . . ("I went back and corrected my errors").
> 3. Task-Specific-Strategy Responses . . . represent task-specific elaborations . . . adapted to meet the demands of the particular writing situation . . . ("I wrote the rough draft of this essay very quickly since I wanted to have time to change my mind on this subject"). (192)

In our reading of postwrites from the project, we found the same patterns of responses, but we also found two additional patterns which led us to refine and enrich Faigley's rubric. For example, under Faigley's category of General Strategy Responses, we found a pattern that we call "Teacher Talk", and contrasted it to the "Writer's Talk" of the more Task-Specific Strategy Responses. "Teacher Talk" was exactly what one of the evaluators referred to when she said, "It sounded to me as if (the students) were regurgitating teacher comments without a clear idea of how 'writing strategies' actually would apply to their own writing." Phrases such as "finding a catchy opening," "expand on my points," "stick to the argument," "woven in more examples," "research my opinion" or "rearrange my sentences. . . so that it would flow better"--the persistence in the minds of our students of these phrases says a lot about the enduring culture of what has been called the "current traditional" mode of composition instruction. Students who wrote these phrases, when asked to comment upon their writing process, did little more than "regurgitate" what they had heard in classrooms.

We found far more appealing, as self-evaluation information, postwrites which sometimes haltingly struggled to explain what had been going on in the writer's mind, such as Meg's answer to the "solution" question:

> I decided to both support and oppose his views, and so I wrote him a letter rather than a straight critique. This was easier for me to kind of agree, but kind of not. I chose to be brief because he was so brief, it seemed more effective. Since I basically agreed and just had a few more opinions, it would seem redundant to really "get into" things.

Meg's answer shares little with textbook language but shows awareness of a writing process that is fundamentally hers, explained in her own more colloquial terms, such as "'get into' things." We also found it interesting when a student appropriated the writing task, consciously placing it in the context of his or her own greater writing experience, such as Kenneth did in his "solutions" answer:

> I chose a specific scheme of attack and just wrote even if it was not my true feelings. I also realized that this grade will have no impact on my final grade so my effort was not as great as usual.

Meg's and Kenneth's answers could stand as very gender-specific examples--an area of research we were naturally very conscious of, given Goucher's recent entry into co-education. But each response clearly showed that the students thought of themselves as writers, as able to control their writing processes for the purposes of that particular writing task. Both Kenneth and Meg were comfortable in assuming the identity of writers, in behaving as writers, not merely as students who wrote with one ear listening for an imaginary teacher's assumed vocabulary.

We also found a similar subset of patterns that demonstrated another of Flower and Hayes' ideas: that novice writers are topic-centered while expert writers see their texts as complex speech acts. The topic-centered writers revealed a high degree of anxiety about what to say about the topic, while the more expert writers were able to see their texts rhetorically and were more interested in deciding what role they wanted to take in addressing their audience. For example, Bill's short postwrite (only three sentences) never left the topic. For the problems he faced, he wrote, "The fact that children might learn the wrong thing from a TV show." For his solution, he wrote, "None, you cannot have a 24 hour sensor (sic) for children." And his revision plans were, "Write a longer letter." Such a postwrite gives no indication that the writer even has a concept of writing as a process; for Bill, writing is totally a matter of transcribing thoughts about a topic, as if the writer serves only as a conduit for the topic.

On the other hand, Shannon's answer to the "aternative plans" question showed a strong consciousness of rhetoric as she considered not one but three alternative plans: 1) "being a child and writing to the editor--couldn't support"; 2) "agreeing with Postman--didn't agree"; and 3) "being a member of a major network exectutive board--didn't feel like it". Shannon saw herself as a rhetor, someone who used language for different purposes for different audiences; she knew that being a writer meant seeing options, analyzing evidence and having an emotional involvement. Even more clearly,

Carter's answer to "alternative plans" appropriated the writing task as his own: he judged his rhetorical options in terms of fun: "I had originally thought that I would write a straight exploration but I couldn't get started because it was no fun to write that way. I had more fun writing the way I did."

Like Meg and Kenneth, Shannon and Carter demonstrated an appropration of the writing task, making it their own; their postwrites demonstrated that their ways of handling the topic were as important, or more important, than the topic itself. Like Meg and Kenneth, Shannon and Carter thought like writers. And that may be the most valuable aspect of self-evaluations: they allow students, of whatever writing ability, to show how much they have appropriated their writing process into their own self-concepts, into their identities. They can think and make decisions about <u>their</u> writing process, not because they are following some received rules, advice, or remedies. Even though their essays might not be successful, those students who are more aware of their struggle, more critically aware of their process, text and identity as writers, should be assessed differently from those who are not aware of a greater context of process, text and their identity as writers.

Besides these additions to Faigley's rubric for self-evaluations, we noticed another dynamic: small but important changes in the way writers thought about writing and themselve <u>as they wrote</u> their postwrites. We found some writers moving from "teacher talk" in their first two answers to "writer's talk" in their last two answers. Some of this movement may be due to the kinds of questions we asked, since "problems" and "solutions" can be listed more succinctly and "plans" invites more discussion. Nonetheless, we noticed some writers moving toward more complex, elaborated and rhetorically sensitive answers in the last two questions. We surmise that this movement indicates something of an initiation into the way writers talk, an initiation into the discourse community of writers.

Like Faigley, et. al., we know that we need further research into the patterns in postwrite responses. Asking these four questions yielded an amount of information which has raised more questions about assessment and ways of expanding assessment. As our research continued, we began asking ourselves if the postwrites reveal not only information about process, rhetorical sensitivity and writer identity, but also information about the different ways student writers know the world through language. We see many potential connections betwen the ways of knowing described

by Belenkey, et. al. in *Women's Ways of Knowing* and the ways of knowing embedded in the way writers talk about their writing tasks, processes and roles.

Discussion

At bottom, our research into self-evaluation led us to reconsider just what we mean by assessment. We went to the OED and disccovered two powerful metaphors in the etymology of the word. Many students would certainly identify with the more common definition: "To estimate officially the value of something for the purpose of apportioning a share of taxation." The operative metaphor behind this definition is indeed frightening; it suggests that when we assess student writing, we are taking the students' writing from them, extracting it for our purposes, not theirs. It is no wonder that writing assessment meets with resistance and increases writer anxiety. We can take the connotation even further: that assessment at its worst, by being a taking away, victimizes the student. And even when assessment is not seen entirely negatively by students, they are hardly willing to give their full commitment to the writing task.

We believe the addition of self-evalution to assessment turns the meaning of the term toward the other, earlier etymological definition: "to sit by" with close connections to the word "assist." We much prefer this metaphor to the first one. And it leads us to expand the context for assessment in key ways: by integrating self-evaluation into the assessment instrument, we are telling the student and ourselves that writing involves constant monitoring, that it is both a performance and a judgment of that performance, and that, as Reed Larson says, "successful writing depends in part on the relationship a writer has with the ongoing work" (in Rose, 39). The integration of self-evalution into assessment also connects with Michael Polanyi's idea of skill as involving the assumption of a role, a change in identity, the development of a kind of connoisseurship, in which "the act of knowing always includes an appraisal." Moreover, this involved personal identification, "which shapes all knowledge, bridges . . . the disjunction between objectivity and subjectivity" (17).

In his essay, "Writer's Block: Thoughts on Composing-Process Research," Mike Rose calls for researchers into writing to develop a cognitive, affective, and contextual "framework" to analyze the composing act. To Rose, analyzing the composing process requires a higher degree of complexity and sensitivity than any one research methodology can supply: "The various dimensions of the framework cannot be

adequately explored by any single method"(210). Similarly, just as we analyze writing for research purposes, so when we analyze writing for evaluation, the composing act requires an expanded framework--sensitive to cognitive, affective and contextual elements.

Self-evaluation is an expansion of the framework of direct assressment, but it also changes the essential meaning of writing assessment, from the assessment of writing to the assessment of writers. Moreover, we would argue that, in order for direct assessment to be less of a tax and more a measure, it must include this aspect of assistance or "sitting by" writers, to help them judge themselves as writers. In such a way, direct assessment can be altered to answer its critics, who prefer assessment by writing portfolio. Usually, critics of direct assessment offer four main arguments:

1) That direct assessment fails to treat writing as a process; that students' writing process is different from their test-taking mode.
2) That direct assessment, as it judges only the written product, fails to treat writing as a multiple construct, with many abilities and skills.
3) That direct assessment fails to extract information that would help both teachers and learners.
4) That direct assessment fails to account for developmental ups and downs over time, or the level of task difficulty.

Although no single test can address the fourth argument--assessing development over time--the addition of self-evaluation does address the other three arguments against direct assessment. Self evaluation does treat writing as a process, and does take students out of their test-taking mode, creating a situation a lot closer to their normal writing process. Sefl-evaluation does treat writing as a multiple construct, by eliciting student comments on problem-solving, rhetorical sensitivities and writer identities. Also, self-evaluation does elicit information that can help both teacher and learner. We propose that self-evaluation, when studied and developed more precisely, can add a dimension to direct assessment which changes its essential nature and moves it much closer to the aims and goals of assessment by portfolio. We believe direct assessment with self-evaluation can provide a workable alternative for those writing programs which are constrained to use a single-test method of assessment.

In summary, the addition of self-evaluation, has three major affects on students in writing assessment situations.

1) It removes a wall between assessment and pedagogy by making writing assessment a learning experience. By connecting assessment with standard classroom practice, we remind students that every time they write they should draw on all they know as writers, that as they take a writing assessment test, they should not lapse into a "test-taking mode" which restricts--even overrides--how they usually write. As in classroom conferences and peer group review, so in assessment students are asked to reflect and judge their writing processes. When students leave such an assessment, there is substantially less chance for them to feel something has been taken from them without their gaining anything in return. Moreover, we have found that when students are given the opportunity to reflect, many use it well, gaining insights from a test situation.

2) It helps students to talk like writers and see themselves as writers. In postwriting, we are bringing to the surface, in an organized way, those "debriefing" feelings which they turn to after taking a test. Students find themselves at the intersection of their feelings about writing--what John Daly calls their "dispositional attitudes" (in Rose, 70)--and what the writing task demand from them. The act of reflecting upon their process leads writers to appropriate the writing task as theirs; as they make this emotional connection, they are able to learn from their process and see other options--in other words, they are enabled to respond as writers, and strengthen their identities as writers.

3) It places the writing task within the greater context of writing as revision. Students are enabled to think beyond the test situation; they are invited to think specifically about strengthening what they might feel--and legitimately so--is a tentative draft. Even if they rely more heavily on received "teacher talk," they have the opportunity to get beyond it, and often they do. As they make the task and the process more their own, they initiate themselves into the discourse community of writers.

We wanted to end this essay by mentioning again Donald Murray's pig and sausage analogy for process and product; the best we could come up with is that self-evaluations add, as it were, a warm, supportive blanket around the assessment instrument--sort of like a "pig in a blanket," still the sausage, but at least metaphorically closer to the proverbial pig. But that is not the metaphor which works best. Better, we like to think that postwrites allow us to expand writing assessment into

the area of a writer's potential by opening a window into the aspect of writing as creation of self, and of the writing process as the way writers create themselves and come to know themselves as writers. As postwrites turn a writer's attention to the process of writing, they allow evaluators to enlarge the focus of assessment to include the writers' dispositions toward writing, their awareness of writing as a process and of rhetorical options, and their development of a writer's identity. This widened focus makes it more likely that assessment can be both more comprehensive and more precise in its evaluation of the abilities, dispositions and skills students must have in order to succeed as writers.

Works Cited

Belenky, Mary Field, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, and Jill Nattuck Tarule. *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice and Mind*. New York: Basic Books, 1986.

Faigley, Lester, Roger D. Cherry, David A. Joliffe, and Anna M. Skinner. *Assessing Writers' Knowledge and Processes of Composing*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1985.

Polanyi, Michael. *Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Rose, Mike (Ed.). *When A Writer Can't Write*. New York: Guilford Press, 1985.

Part II: Post-write ID #_____

Now that you have finished your essay, please answer the following questions. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions; we are interested in your analysis of your experience writing this essay.

1. What problems did you face during the writing of this essay?

2. What solutions did you find for these problems?

3. What alternative plans for this essay did you consider? Why did you reject them?

4. Imagine you had more time to write this essay. What would you do if you were to continue working on it?

5. Rank 1 to 4 according to priority the following elements of composition in your revision plans, with 1 most important and 4 least important):

development and support of your thesis ____

organization of your essay ____

address to your intended audience ____

formation of your paragraphs and sentences ____

from Assessment Update

SUMMARY

0. INADEQUATE

*Fails to identify or misinterprets major points of the passage
*Has no clear organizational pattern or is redundant
*Uses quotation inappropriately
*Includes many errors which interfere with mearning.

1. ADEQUATE

*Briefly identifies the passage's major points and supporting claims
*Has clear introduction and organizational plan, little redundancy
*Uses quotation and paraphrase appropriately
*Uses well-formed sentences.

POSTWRITE

0. NO EVIDENCE OF GREATER CAPABILITY

*This postwrite may be minimally accurate in assessing the student's performance and may give very general revision plans (ie "go back and check it over"), but it does not provide evidence that the student would produce a markedly better essay if he/she continued working on it.

1. SIGNIFICANT EVIDENCE OF GREATER CAPABILITY

*Because of its

*accurate assessment of the the writer's performance,
*appropriate and usable revision plans, or
*articulate language

this postwrite provides evidence either

*that the student would be able to revise significantly and markedly improve the essay, or

*that the essay does not accurately represent the student's writing ability.

Percentages of Postwrites Given Credit